concerning them, whether (the qualities of them) have any real existence at all in the things without us, and not rather a seeming existence only* in our own passions; and there is need of mind or understanding to judge in this case, and to determine the controversy, which sense alone cannot decide.—But the ancient physiologists concluded without any hesitancy, o*5 TO auYo !<m TO p&ir£ •yXu*

cci&<yftit £*€, icai TO a^tv$*ov *r(p 7rt*tpct&<T0eu, That the

nature of honey in itself, is not the same thing with my being sweetened, nor of wormwood with that sense of bitterness which I have from it ;—

$ia<j>£puv Si TO 7ra00£ TOP SJCTOC wojcajusyou, KCU *rag* aicrftrjcraif » TCI *fizv* *1/CTO£ *vwoKUfitva* ov jcaraXtyijSavtcv, /uova 81 a *apa ra* lavTOy *va(hi*[m] But that the passion of sense differed from the absolute nature of the thing itself without; the senses not comprehending the objects themselves, but only their own passions from them.—

I say, therefore, that the ancients concluded the absolute nature of corporeal things in themselves to be nothing but a certain disposition of parts, in respect of magnitude, figure, site* and motion, which in tastes cause us to be differently affected with those senses of sweetness and bitterness.! and in sight with those fancies of colours, and accordingly in the other senses with other fancies ; and that the corporeal world was to be explained by these two things, whereof one is absolute in the bodies without us, the various mechanism of them; the other relative only to us, the different fancies in us> caused by the respective differences of them' in themselves. Which fancies, or fantastic ideas, are no modes of the bodies without us, but of that only in

ourselves, which is cogita-